UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,175	08/18/2003	Steven E. Millman	YOR920030322US1 (8728-640	3640

7590 02/06/2007

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 WOODBURY ROAD
WOODBURY, NY 11797

EXAMINER	
TUCKER, WESLEY J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/643,175	MILLMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wes Tucker	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 August 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 April 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 and 9-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patents 7,142,226 to Sakuta and 5,420,605 to Vouri et al.

With regard to claim 1, Sakuta discloses a method for improving the legibility of an application written for a lower pixel density monitor and displayed on a higher pixel density monitor, wherein the screen resolution of the higher pixel density monitor is set to a native resolution (column 1, lines 31-50), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a first input signal from a user (column 2, lines 3-6); and

programmatically changing the screen resolution in one atomic step from the native resolution to a lower resolution in response to the first input signal (column 2, lines 7-14 and column 7, lines 3-37 and column 9, lines 24-28);

As disclosed in Sakuta, when a user selects an application and the selection of that application cause the display mode and resolution to be automatically changed accordingly, this is interpreted as receiving a first input signal from a user. Also Sakuta disclose the automatic resolution switching is determined according to the need of the

selected application. When a user chooses an application for which a lower resolution than the presently used resolution is appropriate the resolution is switched automatically.

Sakuta does not explicitly disclose that the native or present resolution is at least 33% greater in pixel density than the lower resolution. However it should be apparent that most resolution increments found on commercial computers are usually incremented or differ by a degree of at least 33%.

Vouri discloses a method of switching resolutions and explicitly teaches switching between the resolutions 640x480, 800x600 and 1024x768. The difference between 1024x768 and 800x600 is 39%. The difference between 800x600 and 640x480 is 36%. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to switch between the standard resolutions fro computer monitors in the invention of Sakuta and as evidenced by Vouri, the standard monitor sizes listed would constitute the degrees of at least 33% difference in the pixel density.

With regard to claim 2, Sakuta discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

receiving a second input signal from a user; and programmatically changing the screen resolution in one atomic step from the lower resolution to the native resolution in response to the second input signal (column 2, lines 7-14 and column 7, lines 3-37 and column 9, lines 24-28);

As disclosed in Sakuta, when a user selects an application and the selection of that application cause the display mode and resolution to be automatically changed accordingly, this is interpreted as receiving a first input signal from a user. Also Sakuta disclose the automatic resolution switching is determined according to the need of the selected application. When a user chooses another application (second user input) for which the switched resolution is not the resolution of choice, the resolution is switched back to the first resolution or another resolution appropriate for the newly selected application.

With regard to claim 9, Sakuta and Vouri disclose the method of claim 2, but do not explicitly disclose the steps of: moving a foreground window to a screen origin in response to the first signal; and saving original coordinates of the foreground window in response to the first signal.

This feature is exceedingly well known in the art. Ever since at least Microsoft Windows 95, a user can hit the maximize button in the upper left corner of a window and the window moves its corner to the origin and fills the entire screen. Official Notice is taken that this feature is exceedingly well known in the art as shown by Microsoft Windows 95.

With regard to claim 10, Sakuta and Vouri disclose the method of claim 9, further comprising the steps of: moving the foreground window to the position specified by the

original coordinates in response to the second signal; and discarding the original coordinates. The discussion of claim 9 with regard to Windows 95 applies. This second user input is interpreted as the restore button that replaces the window to its previous coordinates before it was maximized. Official Notice is taken that this feature is exceedingly well known in the art as shown by Microsoft Windows 95.

With regard to claim 11, the discussions of claims 9 and 10 apply. The steps of: moving a foreground window to a screen origin in response to the first signal; saving original coordinates of the foreground window in response to the first signal; and storing a unique identifier of the foreground window is interpreted as maximizing the window to fill the entire display screen. This is well known as displayed by Microsoft Windows 95.

With regard to claim 12, the discussions of claim 9, 10 and 11 apply. The steps of: moving the foreground window identified by the unique identifier to the position specified by the original coordinates in response to the second signal; and discarding the original coordinates and the unique identifier is interpreted as clicking on the restore button after a window has been maximized. This is well known as displayed by Microsoft Windows 95.

With regard to claim 13, Sakuta and Vouri disclose the method of claim 1, wherein programmatically changing the screen resolution in one atomic step from the

native resolution to a lower resolution in response to the first input signal comprises: determining if the native resolution is a first resolution; and if the native resolution is the first resolution, changing the screen resolution in one atomic step from the native resolution to the lower resolution in response to the first input signal (column 2, lines 7-14 and column 7, lines 3-37 and column 9, lines 24-28);

As disclosed in Sakuta, when a user selects an application and the selection of that application cause the display mode and resolution to be automatically changed accordingly, this is interpreted as receiving a first input signal from a user. Also Sakuta disclose the automatic resolution switching is determined according to the need of the selected application. When a user chooses an application for which a lower resolution than the presently used resolution is appropriate the resolution is switched automatically.

With regard to claim 14, Sakuta and Vouri disclose the method of claim 13, and Sakuta discloses further comprising: determine a first difference between the native resolution and the first resolution; determine a second difference between the native resolution and the lower resolution; if the first difference is greater than the second difference, changing the screen resolution in one atomic step from the native resolution to the first resolution; and if the second difference is greater than the first different, changing the screen resolution in one atomic step from the native resolution to the lower resolution (column 2, lines 7-14 and column 7, lines 3-37 and column 9, lines 24-28);

As disclosed in Sakuta, when a user selects an application and the selection of that application cause the display mode and resolution to be automatically changed accordingly, this is interpreted as receiving a first input signal from a user. Also Sakuta disclose the automatic resolution switching is determined according to the need of the selected application. When a user chooses an application for which a lower resolution than the presently used resolution is appropriate the resolution is switched automatically.

With regard to claim 15, Sakuta and Vouri disclose the method of claim 2, and Sakuta further discloses wherein programmatically changing the screen resolution in one atomic step from the lower resolution to the native resolution in response to the second input signal comprises: determining if the lower resolution is a second resolution; and if the lower resolution is the second resolution, changing the screen resolution in one atomic step from the lower resolution to the native resolution in response to the second input signal (column 2, lines 7-14 and column 7, lines 3-37 and column 9, lines 24-28);

As disclosed in Sakuta, when a user selects an application and the selection of that application cause the display mode and resolution to be automatically changed accordingly, this is interpreted as receiving a first input signal from a user. Also Sakuta disclose the automatic resolution switching is determined according to the need of the selected application. When a user chooses an application for which a lower resolution

than the presently used resolution is appropriate the resolution is switched automatically.

With regard to claim 16, Sakuta and Vouri disclose the method of claim 15, and Sakuta discloses further comprising: determining a first difference between the lower resolution and the second resolution; determine a second difference between the lower resolution and the native resolution; if the first difference is greater than the second difference, changing the screen resolution in one atomic step from the lower resolution to the second resolution; and if the second difference is greater than the first difference, changing the screen resolution in one atomic step from the lower resolution to the native resolution (column 2, lines 7-14 and column 7, lines 3-37 and column 9, lines 24-28);

As disclosed in Sakuta, when a user selects an application and the selection of that application cause the display mode and resolution to be automatically changed accordingly, this is interpreted as receiving a first input signal from a user. Also Sakuta disclose the automatic resolution switching is determined according to the need of the selected application. When a user chooses an application for which a lower resolution than the presently used resolution is appropriate the resolution is switched automatically.

With regard to claims 17 and 18, the discussion of claim 1 applies. The combination of Sakuta and Vouri discloses both a system (Sakuta, Fig. 1 and Vouri, Fig.

1) and a machine-readable medium having instructions stored thereon for executing the method (Sakuta, Figs. 2, 3 and 4 and Vouri Fig. 2).

With regard to claim 19, Sakuta and Vouri disclose the method of claim 1, and Sakuta discloses wherein programmatically changing the screen resolution in one atomic step from the native resolution to a lower resolution in response to the first input signal comprises programmatically changing the screen resolution without interleaving access by another process from the native resolution to a lower resolution in response to the first input signal (column 2, lines 7-14 and column 7, lines 3-37 and column 9, lines 24-28);

As disclosed in Sakuta, when a user selects an application and the selection of that application cause the display mode and resolution to be automatically changed accordingly, this is interpreted as receiving a first input signal from a user. Also Sakuta disclose the automatic resolution switching is determined according to the need of the selected application. When a user chooses an application for which a lower resolution than the presently used resolution is appropriate the resolution is switched automatically.

With regard to claim 20, the discussion of claim 19 applies.

Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patents 7,142,226 to Sakuta and 5,420,605 to Vouri et al and U.S. Patent 5,926,166 to Khederzadeh et al.

With regard to claim 3, Sakuta and Vouri disclose the method of claim 1, but do not disclose explicitly monitoring a keyboard input queue. Vouri discloses a keyboard for various user input functions (column 4, lines 30-39) and it is reasonable to assume that Sakuta would make use of a keyboard since it is in the environment of a personal computer, however neither reference teaches monitoring a keyboard input queue. Khederzadeh discloses the use of a "hot key" input that causes an interrupt for changing the resolution of a display device (column 2, lines 44-67). The use of keyboards and "hot key" sequences are extremely well known in the art. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the hot key taught by Khederzadeh to switch between the resolutions of Sakuta and Vouri.

With regard to claim 4, the discussion of claim 3 above applies. When an input is received from a keyboard input, it is typically removed from the queue where it was waiting.

With regard to claims 5-8, the discussion of claims 3 and 4 apply. Using a hot key input from a keyboard as input data is disclosed by Khederzadeh, and resolution switching back and forth is taught by both Sakuta and Vouri.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wes Tucker whose telephone number is 571-272-7427. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Bella can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Wes Tucker

2-1-07

Matthew C. Bella

MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600